

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program - Local Parks Evaluation Criteria

The 2018-2022 Recreation and Conservation Plan and Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Unifying Strategy establishes priorities for funding outdoor recreation in Washington State. This evaluation instrument incorporates the plan's priorities identified specifically for the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) to address underserved populations and health improvements.

Below are the changes to the evaluation instrument to reflect the 2018-2022 Unifying Strategy. These changes are incorporated into the evaluation criteria starting in the 2018 grant round.

- Add specific instructions on how to reply to criteria #1 "Public Need".
 - This change identifies the types of underserved populations and health indicators where the project is located.
- Remove criteria #3 "SCORP Priorities".
 - This question is replaced by the addition to criteria #1.

WWRP Local Parks Criteria Summary					
Scored by	#	Title	Project Type Questions	Maximum Points	Focus*
Advisory Committee	1	Public Need	All	15	Local
Advisory Committee	2	Project Scope	All	15	Local
Advisory Committee	3	SCORP Priorities	All	5	State
Advisory Committee	4 <u>3</u>	Immediacy of Threat	Acquisition	10	Local
			Combination	5	
Advisory Committee	5 <u>4</u>	Project Design	Development	15	Technical
			Combination	7.5	
Advisory Committee	6 <u>5</u>	Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship	All	10	State
Advisory Committee	7 <u>6</u>	Site Suitability	Acquisition	5	Technical
			Combination	2.5	
Advisory Committee	8 <u>7</u>	Expansion/Renovation	All	5	Local
Advisory Committee	9 <u>8</u>	Project Support	All	10	State, Local
Advisory Committee	10 <u>9</u>	Cost Efficiencies	All	5	State, Local
RCO Staff	11 <u>10</u>	Growth Management Act Preference	All	0	State
RCO Staff	12 <u>11</u>	Population Proximity	All	3	State
Total Points Possible=83 <u>78</u>					

*Focus—Criteria orientation in accordance with the following priorities:

- State—Those that meet general statewide needs (often called for in Revised Codes of Washington or State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan [SCORP])
- Local—Those that meet local needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in local plans)
- Technical—Those that meet technical considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

Detailed Scoring Criteria for Local Parks

Advisory Committee Scored

- 1. Public Need.** (acquisition, development, and combination projects) Considering the availability of existing outdoor recreation facilities within the service area, what is the need for new or improved facilities and how will this project address the priorities for underserved populations and health recommendations in the 2018-2022 Recreation and Conservation Plan?

Establish the recreation need by inventorying all available outdoor recreation opportunities (quality/quantity) within the service area. In general, areas with fewer outdoor recreation sites will score higher than those with more. In addition, consider whether or not the project is named by location or type as a priority in an adopted plan.

To assist you in answering the questions about underserved populations and health recommendations, locate your project on the Grant Applicant Data Tool to determine whether your project is in a census tract in which one or more of the populations listed below are present. You also may provide more specific data about the demographics and health conditions of the population within the service area of the proposed project.

Demographic Measures for Underserved Populations

- The median household income level in the census tract where the project is located is below the median statewide household income level (\$62,108 as of 2015)
- Based on percentage, there are more people of color in the census tract where the project is located than the statewide percentage (30 percent as of 2015)
- Based on percentage, there are more people with a disability in the census tract where the project is located than the statewide percentage (13 percent as of 2015)

Opportunities for Health Improvements

- The body mass index for ages 16-19 in the census tract where the project is located is higher than the state body mass index (22.94 as of 2015)
- The mortality rate in the census tract where the project is located is higher than the statewide mortality rate (692 as of 2015)

▲ Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 3.

Revised October 2017.

- 2. Project Scope.** (acquisition, development, and combination projects) Does the project scope meet deficient recreational opportunities within the service area as identified in Question 1 "Public Need?"

This question seeks to determine how well this project satisfies the recreation needs identified in Question 1. Projects that more fully satisfy needs will score higher than those that do less.

Normally, projects offering a variety of recreation opportunities particularly in service areas with few opportunities will score higher than those offering few or a single opportunity. However, if a single, significant need is identified in Question 1 and strongly met as a single element, the project can score well on this question.

- ▲ Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 3.

~~**3. SCORP Priorities.** How will this project address statewide or regional priorities as described in the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)?~~

- ~~● How will this project specifically provide a diversity of recreation opportunities that meet the needs of the state's underserved populations which are:~~
 - ~~○ People with disabilities~~
 - ~~○ People of color~~
 - ~~○ Residents over 46 years old~~
 - ~~○ Women~~
- ~~● How will this project help increase physical activities among people of all ages and abilities or low income and diverse communities?~~
- ~~● Will this project support federal, state, regional or local health initiatives such as:~~
 - ~~○ National Physical Activity Plan~~
 - ~~○ Healthy Communities Washington from the Washington Department of Health~~
 - ~~○ Local Community Health Assessment or Local Community Health Improvement Plan~~
 - ~~○ Health Impact Assessments from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and Pew Charitable Trust~~

- ~~▲ Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points.~~

4.3. Immediacy of Threat. (acquisition and combination projects) Is there a threat to the public availability of the resources the site possesses?

Consider the availability of alternatives. Where none exists, the significance of a threat may be higher.

- ▲ Point Range below. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points. The scores for acquisition project are multiplied later by 2.

0 points	No evidence presented
1-2 points	Minimal threat; site resource opportunity appears to be in no immediate danger of a loss in quality or to public use in the next 36 months.
3 points	Actions are under consideration that could result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for public use.
4-5 points	Actions will be taken that will result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for future public use or a threat situation has occurred or is imminent and has led a land trust to acquire rights in the land at the request of the applicant agency.

Revised January 2008

5.4. Project Design. (development and combination projects) Does the project demonstrate good design criteria? Does it make the best use of the site?

Measure the quality of the functional and aesthetic aspects of the site design as related to the site and the proposed uses. Will site resources appropriately be made available for recreation? Will environmental or other important values be protected by the proposed development? Consider the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, and location of the site to determine if it is well suited for the intended uses. Some design elements that may be considered include:

- Accuracy of cost estimates
- Recreation experience
- Aesthetics
- Risk management
- Maintenance
- Site Suitability
- Materials
- Space Relationships
- Phasing
- User-friendly, barrier-free

- ▲ Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 3 for development project and 1.5 for combination projects.

Revised September 2011

6.5. Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship. Will the project result in a quality, sustainable, recreational opportunity while protecting the integrity of the environment?

Factors to consider for acquisition and/or development and renovation projects are outlined in the table below.

Acquisition	Development and Renovation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the acquisition and proposed development preserve the natural function of the site? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposed development protect natural resources onsite and integrate sustainable elements such as low impact development techniques, green infrastructure, or environmentally preferred building products?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do the proposed uses protect, enhance or restore the ecosystem functions of the property? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there invasive species on site? If there are, what is your response plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vegetation/Surfaces – Are you replacing invasive plant species with native vegetation? Are you using pervious surfaces for any of the proposed facilities?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the strategy or plan for maintenance and stewardship of the site? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education – Are you installing interpretive panels/signs that educate users about sustainability?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do the natural characteristics of the site support future planned uses? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Materials – What sustainable materials are included in the project?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide for greater fuel economy, is the proposed acquisition located close to the intended users? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Energy – What energy efficient features are you adding?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What modes of transportation provide access to the site? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What modes of transportation provide access to the site?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does this project protect wetlands or wetland functions? Describe the size, quality, and classification. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water – Is the on-site storm water managed by rain gardens, porous paving, or other sustainable features? Does the design exceed permit requirements for storm water management?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the proposed acquisition help create connectivity? How many acres are already protected? How critical is this property to the overall plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If there are wetlands on site, describe the size, quality and classification and explain how the design considers the wetland functions.

Acquisition	Development and Renovation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other noteworthy characteristics demonstrate how the natural features of the site contribute to energy efficiency, less maintenance, fewer environmental impacts, or sustainability? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the strategy or plan for long-term maintenance and stewardship of the site?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other developed features will contribute to increasing energy efficiencies, reducing maintenance, minimizing environmental impacts, or being more sustainable?

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 2.

Adopted January 2014.

7.6. Site Suitability. (acquisition and combination projects) Is the site to be acquired well suited for the intended recreational uses?

Compare the site's physical features against the proposed use. Consider the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, and location of the site to determine if it is well suited for the intended uses. In general, sites most compatible to the uses proposed score higher.

▲ Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 0.5 for combination projects.

Revised January 2008

8.7. Expansion or Renovation. (acquisition, development, and combination projects) Will the acquisition or development project expand or renovate an existing recreation area or facility?

Recognizes that expansion or renovation projects generally provide greater benefit-to-cost ratios than new projects. Projects that add to existing assets also often provide greater management flexibility and resource diversity.

▲ Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points.

Revised May 2003

9.8. Project Support. (acquisition, development, and combination projects) The extent that the public (statewide, community, and/or user groups) has been provided with an adequate opportunity to become informed, and/or support for the project seems apparent.

Broadly interpret the term "Project Support" to include, but not be limited to:

- Extent of efforts by the applicant to identify and contact all parties, i.e. an outreach program to local, regional, and statewide entities.
- The extent that there is project support, including:
 - Voter-approved initiatives, bond issues, referenda.
 - Ordinance and resolution adoption.
 - Public meeting attendance.
 - Endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user or friends groups.
 - Media coverage.
- The extent to which the public was involved in a comprehensive planning process that includes this project.

▲ Point Range Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

0 points	No evidence presented.
1-2 points	Marginal community support. Opportunities for only minimal public involvement (i.e. a single adoption hearing), and/or little evidence that the public supports the project.
3 points	Adequate support.
4-5 points	The public has received ample and varied opportunity to provide meaningful input into the project, and there is overwhelming support; and/or the public was so supportive from the project's inception that an extensive public participation process was not necessary.

Revised March 1997

10.9. Cost Efficiencies. To what extent does this project demonstrate efficiencies or a reduction in government costs through documented use of donations or other resources?

- Donations – cash, real property, volunteer labor, equipment use, or materials
 - What are the donations for this project?
 - Who is making the donations?
 - What are the value of the donations and how were the values determined?

- o Are the donations in hand?
- o If the donations are not in hand, do you have a letter of commitment from the donor that specifies what is being donated and when?
- o Are the donations necessary for implementation of the project? Are donations included in the project proposal?
- Private grants awarded by non-governmental organizations
 - o Is there a private grant that is being used as match for this project?
 - o Who awarded the grant?
 - o What is the grant amount?
 - o What is the purpose of the grant?
 - o When will grant funds be available?
- Are there other efficiencies for this project that will result in cost savings?
 - o What is the cost efficiency?
 - o Who is providing it?
 - o What's the value?
 - o When was the commitment made and when does it expire?

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award 0-5 points.

Revised February 2016.

Scored by RCO Staff—Applicants Do Not Answer in Evaluation Session

11.10. Growth Management Act Preference. (acquisition, development, and combination projects) Has the applicant made progress toward meeting the requirements of the Growth Management Act?¹

State law requires the following:

- A. Whenever a state agency is considering awarding grants to finance public facilities, it shall consider whether the applicant² has adopted a comprehensive

¹Revised Code of Washington 43.17.250 (Growth Management Act preference required.)

²County, city, or town applicants only. This segment of the question does not apply to state agency or tribal government applicants.

plan and development regulations as required by Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.040.

- B. When reviewing such requests, the state agency shall accord additional preference to applicants that have adopted the comprehensive plan and development regulations. An applicant is deemed to have satisfied the requirements for adopting a comprehensive plan and development regulations if it:
- o Adopts or has adopted within the time periods specified in state law;
 - o Adopts or has adopted by the time it requests a grant or loan; or
 - o Demonstrates substantial progress toward adopting within the time periods specified in state law. An agency that is more than 6 months out of compliance with the time periods has not demonstrated substantial progress.
- C. A request from an applicant planning under state law shall be accorded no additional preference based on subsection (B) over a request from an applicant not planning under this state law.

RCO staff score this question using information from the state Department of Commerce, Growth Management Division. Scoring occurs after RCO's technical completion deadline. If an agency's comprehensive plan, development regulation, or amendment has been appealed to the Growth Management Hearings Board, the agency cannot be penalized during the period of appeal.

▲ Point Range below. RCO staff subtracts a maximum of 1 point; there is no multiplier.

- | | |
|----------|---|
| -1 point | The applicant does not meet the requirements of Revised Code of Washington 43.17.250. |
| 0 points | The applicant meets the requirements of Revised Code of Washington 43.17.250. |
| 0 points | The applicant is a nonprofit organization, state, or federal agency. |

Revised January 2014

12.11. Population Proximity. Is the project in a populated area? (acquisition, development, and combination projects)³

³Revised Code of Washington 79A.25.250

This question is scored by RCO staff based on a map provided by the applicant. To receive a score, the map must show the project location and project boundary in relationship to a city's or town's urban growth boundary.

▲ Point Range below. The result from "A" is added to the result from "B." Projects in cities with more than 5,000 population *and* within high density counties receive points from both "A" and "B." RCO staff awards a maximum of 3

A. The project is located within the urban growth boundary of a city or town with a population of 5,000 or more.

Yes 1.5 points

No 0 points

AND

B. The project is located within a county with a population density of 250 or more people per square mile.

Yes 1.5 points

No 0 points

Revised November 2007